

Item # 69

**SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

SUBJECT: MYRTLE STREET CONSERVATION VILLAGE CONCEPT
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT AMENDMENT

DEPARTMENT: Planning & Development **DIVISION:** Planning Division

AUTHORIZED BY: Donald S. Fisher **CONTACT:** Tony Walter **EXT.** 7375

Agenda Date 8/12/03 **Regular** ☐ **Consent** ☐ **Work Session** ☐ **Briefing** ☐
Public Hearing – 1:30 ☒ **Public Hearing – 7:00** ☐

MOTION/RECOMMENDATION:

1. TRANSMIT the proposed text amendments to the Seminole County Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to implement the Conservation Village Design Concept in the Myrtle Street Special Study Area, with staff findings: or
2. DO NOT TRANSMIT the proposed text amendments to the Seminole County Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan to implement the Conservation Village Design Concept in the Myrtle Street Special Study Area; or.
3. CONTINUE this item to a date and time certain.

District 5 - McLain

Tony Walter, Principal Planner

BACKGROUND:

In March 2003 the Board of County Commissioners instructed staff to pursue implementation of the Conservation Village Design Concept for the Myrtle Street Special Study Area to coincide with the Fall 2003 Comprehensive Plan update. The proposed text amendments will provide policies addressing implementation of the Conservation Village Design Concept within the Myrtle Street area only.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

RECOMMEND transmittal of the proposed text amendments to the Seminole County Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan to DCA.

Attachments: Proposed Draft Text Amendments

Reviewed by:
Co Atty: KZC
DFS: MMW
Other: SS
DCM: 166
CM: 166
File No. ph130pdp04

LPA/P&Z RECOMMENDATION:

At the July 23, 2003 public hearing, the LPA/P&Z voted 4 to 1 to recommend that the proposed Myrtle Street Conservation Village Concept Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment be transmitted to the Florida Department of Community Affairs. Four members of the public spoke in favor of the proposed amendments. No one spoke in opposition. LPA/P&Z comments included the need to address density early on in the development process, concern that the land development code does not provide the flexibility needed to address conservation issues adequately, and that financial impacts to both the public and private sectors be considered.

MYRTLE STREET SPECIAL AREA STUDY PHASE III UPDATE

The purpose of the Phase III Study is to identify and prepare needed amendments to Seminole County's Vision 2020 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to incorporate policies supportive of the "conservation village" development and design concepts identified in Phase II. Phase III will also involve preparation of new or amended ordinance provisions in the Seminole County Land Development Code and the evaluation of possible incentive approaches to facilitate implementation of the concept.

Phase III activities will be conducted to coincide with the County's upcoming schedule for consideration of Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan amendments in the Fall 2003 amendment cycle and conclude with adoption in December, 2003. The results of Phase III will be presented to the Land Planning Agency/Planning & Zoning and Board of County Commissioners later this summer.

To begin the plan amendment process, Staff has prepared a proposed draft text amendment to update Issue FLU 7, Special Area Plans and Evaluation and Appraisal Report Amendments and a new Policy FLU 9.3, Myrtle Street Study Area Conservation Village Development Concept to add to Objective FLU 9, Specific Area Plans for consideration by the Board of County Commissioners.

CONSERVATION VILLAGE POLICIES FOR FALL 2003 AMENDMENT CYCLE August 26, 2003

OBJECTIVE FLU SPECIFIC AREA PLANS

Proposed new policy

Policy FLU 9.3 Myrtle Street Study Area Conservation Village Development Concept

The County shall provide for creative design concepts focused on preservation of natural open spaces, sensitive lands and area character within planned unit developments in the Myrtle Street Special Study area to:

- A Maximize preservation of conservation areas and unique features of the site;
- B Encourage creative design by clustering homes into "villages" surrounded by natural open spaces;
- C Incorporate trail and pedestrian opportunities;
- D Promote enhanced street systems resulting in reduced infrastructure and impervious surfaces;
- E Provide for storm water conveyance and retention that exceeds on-site requirements; and
- F Allow for the ability to add density to achieve open space.

Proposed addition Issues and Concerns as noted below.

Issue FLU 7 Special Area Plans and Evaluation and Appraisal Report Amendments

Since Plan adoption in 1991, several areas of the County have been identified as requiring more effective growth management techniques and community consensus building to ensure consistency with the goals and objectives of the Future Land Use Element. To address these concerns, several special area studies have been completed. Included among these is the "GreeneWay/SR 434 Small Area Study" (1994), "Airport Area Land Use Study" (1995), Northwest HIP Study (1995 and associated North I-4 Target Area Master Plan in 1996), "Chuluota Small Area Study" (1999), **and "Wekiva Special Area Study" (1999), and Myrtle Street Special Area Study (2003).**

These studies have resulted in future land use amendments and/or policy amendments to the Plan to manage growth and development more effectively.

Additionally, in 1999, upon evaluation of the *Exhibit FLU: Future Land Use Map*, the County adopted a number of administrative future land use amendments on properties throughout the County where it was determined that the existing future land use designation was no longer appropriate. These future land use amendments and amendments resulting from the Chuluota Small Area Study and Wekiva Special Area Study were identified in the County's 1999 Evaluation and Appraisal Report found sufficient by the Florida Department of Community Affairs.

**MINUTES OF THE SEMINOLE COUNTY
LPA/P&Z COMMISSION
JULY 23, 2003
6:00 P.M.**

Members present: Ben Tucker, Beth Hattaway, Thomas Mahoney, Dudley Bates, Chris Dorworth, Alan Peltz

Absent: Richard Harris

Also present: Matt West, Planning Manager, Don Fisher, Manager of Planning and Development Division, Karen Consalo, Assistant County Attorney, Tony Matthews, Principal Planner, Dick Boyer, Senior Planner, and Candace Lindlaw-Hudson, Sr. Staff Assistant.

- E. Conservation Village, Seminole County, Applicant;** Update of Issue FLU 7, Special Area Plans and Evaluation and Appraisal Report Amendments and add Policy FLU 9.3 Special Area Plans to include Myrtle Street Study Area Conservation Village Development Concept.

County Wide
Tony Walter, Principal Planner

Mr. Walter introduced the item by stating that at the March 11, 2003 Board of County Commissioners meeting staff was instructed to pursue implementation of the Conservation Village Design Concept for the Myrtle Street Special Study Area. Staff was also directed to proceed with Phase III of the Study to coincide with the upcoming schedule for Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan amendments. The Phase III Myrtle Street Study is currently underway.

The purpose of the Phase III Study is to identify and prepare needed amendments to Seminole County's Vision 2020 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan to incorporate policies supportive of the "conservation village" development and design concepts identified in Phase II. Phase III will also involve preparation of new or amended ordinance provisions in the Seminole County Land Development Code and the evaluation of possible incentive approaches to facilitate implementation of the concept.

Mr. Walter stated that the Phase III activities will be conducted to coincide with the County's upcoming schedule for consideration of Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan amendments in the Fall 2003 amendment cycle and conclude with adoption in December, 2003. The results of Phase III will be presented to the LPA/P&Z later this summer.

Mr. Walter said that to begin the plan amendment process, staff has prepared a proposed draft text amendment to update Issue FLU 7, Special Area Plans and

Evaluation and Appraisal Report Amendments and a new Policy FLU 9.3, Myrtle Street Study Area Conservation Village Development Concept to add to Objective FLU 9, Specific Area Plans for LPA/P&Z consideration and recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Mahoney asked the purpose of FLU 7. What are we trying to accomplish by adding that to the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Walter stated that it is to address efficiency in development.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that he saw no purpose in creating a history of what we had done previously in the Comprehensive Plan.

No one had questions from the public.

The public hearing portion of the meeting was now closed.

Commissioner Mahoney asked about density in the conservation village concept.

Mr. Walter stated that density is not addressed in the concept. It may be added later on.

Robert King stated that this concept should be promoted.

Robert Jasmine stated that Commissioner McLain asked him in October of 2001 to form a steering committee. The committee wants to remain suburban estates at one unit per acre. There is a need to work out who will be paying for things like the \$22.5 million price tag for storm water improvement in this area in phase 3. Mr. Jasmine stated that the committee thinks the concept can work at one unit per acre. There may not be enough land to work this out, however. He hopes that this can be passed on.

Debra Shafer of 1740 Bromley Road stated that this concept can be used in several areas of the county. We must address density. She asked to have this passed forward.

Hugh Harling stated that there is definitely a market for smaller lots. It is good to provide variety in lot size. Sameness does not provide value. Density influences ability to deliver services to an area. The Conservation Village will save wild life and provide for drainage. The Code and Public Works are the biggest challenge to developers today. Standards have shifted. Smaller road systems should be able to be designed. Exceptions to current requirements would help.

Don Fisher stated that Mr. Walter will be presenting this concept to the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Tucker asked if the concept would be applied throughout the county with slight modifications.

Mr. Fisher stated that this concept will help to point out areas to be preserved on a property under development and for preservation of open space.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that the Board of County Commissioners had already directed the execution of Phase 3. He wanted to add that density should be addressed early. Density is necessary to have services delivered. Don Fisher stated that financial feasibility is part of the Phase 3 consideration.

Commissioner Hattaway asked about exceptions being provided in this element.

Mr. Fisher stated that exceptions will be recommended as part of the Conservation Village Element.

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend to the BCC that they adopt Policy FLU 9.3.

Commissioner Peltz seconded the motion.

The motion passed by unanimous consent (6 – 0).

Commissioner Mahoney made a motion to recommend to the BCC that they not adopt FLU 7.

Commissioner Dorworth seconded the motion.

Commissioner Bates pointed out that the difference was only the addition of a few words.

Commissioner Mahoney withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Peltz made a motion to recommend approval of FLU 7.

Commissioner Bates seconded the motion.

Commissioner Mahoney stated that he objected and would be voting “no.”

The motion passed by a vote of 5 – 1.